



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Desto is given only under *ju*, and *skull*, only under *för* (cf. above). In certain cases it would seem desirable to give fuller meanings for words in the vocabulary, even though the meanings in question probably do not occur in the text; e. g., under *någon* the only rendering given is "anybody" (add "some, any, somebody"); so under *närmast* I should suggest adding "nearest." In not a few instances words are in the wrong alphabetical order (as *eländig*, *flytta*). There is some inconsistency in referring from irregular and strong forms to the lexicographical form; thus there is no reference from *bönderna* (8), *satte* (14), *gåvo* (26), which would require this fully as much as *funno*, *fortsatte*, and *föreslago*, where references are given.

I do not find many errors in the vocabulary. For *betjüna* the past is given as *-te*, which is colloquial and poetic; the vocabulary should, of course, in the first place include the normal form, even if other forms occur in the text. For *jord* no plural is given. Under *länge* the meaning "far" seems impossible. In giving the declensional forms of *malmåder* the editor seems to have confused *åder* and *ådra*. The principal parts of *närvara* need adjustment, and *syskon* is wrongly given as indeclinable. Instead of *äldsta*, *äldst* is no doubt intended.

Misprints are not numerous. One or two of the more important ones are: under *farvatten*, "fair-way" should be "fare-way"; *kvall* (p. 23, n. 2) should be *kväll*.

The general appearance of this volume is made more attractive than that of the other volumes of its series by the use of a more pleasing paper. In other respects the book has the same general and typographical shortcomings as the *Frilöfs saga* edition (see the review of this). In *Valda berättelser*, as in *Mina pojkar*, the notes are at the bottom of the pages. No doubt there are some teachers who prefer this, at least in an occasional book, but the usual practise is to have the notes away from the text-page. For the convenience of teacher and student I should suggest also that in a later edition the lines be numbered.

A. LOUIS ELMQUIST.

MINA POJKAR, AV GUSTAV AV GEIJERSTAM, edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary by Joseph Alexis. Second edition. Rock Island, Ill., 1915 (year not stated). Augustana Book Concern. Pp. 167.

It is safe to say that none of the Swedish text-editions hitherto published has given more pleasure both to student and teacher than this delightful little book of Geijerstam's.

The second edition differs from the first chiefly through the addition of about ten notes, mostly stylistic, and some small adjustments in the vocabulary, together with corrections of a few misprints.

While the added notes deal largely with differences between written and spoken Swedish, most matters of this kind are still without comment. I shall mention here a partial list of cases where I should suggest notes in a third edition, including a few that have nothing to do with style: *store bror* (page 7, line 20), *vet alla gossar* (8, 27), *sta'n* (10, 81), *annat än* (10, 85), *ska'* (12, 145), *vet jag* (12, 149), *sa'* (15, 66), *ner* (15, 80), *ett tecken* (16, 112), order of *inte*

(18, 153; cf. order of *aldrig*, 77, 69), inversion in subordinate clauses, very common throughout the book (20, 47), *opp* (21, 66), *nå'n* (22, 101), *da'r* (22, 102), *spöt* (24, 31), *huvu't* (33, 125), *nå'nning* (36, 71), *se'n* (39, 146), *så'n* (44, 116), *hjälp'te inte* (50, 139), *dörrn* (61, 185), *trä't* (63, 27), *förn* (88, 48), *vilket han var* (89, 68), *de kallar* (89, 73), *de'* (90, 98), *stjälpte gjorde* (96, 98), *gård'n* (104, 131), *kosta vad det vill* (105, 152), *så blir ni olyckliga* (107, 205). In one or two of the cases mentioned there are notes, but the shorter forms are merely said to be contractions of the regular forms.

In the note on *Skeppsholmen* (p. 13) more of interest could have been added. Unnecessary are on the contrary the notes p. 77, n. 2 and p. 120, n. 3.

I have observed about a dozen belated notes: page 7, note 1 (earlier occurrence of matter commented on, page 7, line 2); 12, n. 1 (11, 123); 17, n. 2 (10, 84); 53, n. 1 (15, 66); 75, n. 2 (10, 3); 78, n. 2 (15, 74); 88, n. 4 (41, 39); 90, n. 1 (33, 123); 101, n. 3 (15, 55; 32, 93); 102, n. 1 (9, 68); 106, n. 1 (10, 81); 114, n. 2 (73, 145). In the case of invertible compound verbs occurring in the loosely attached form of verb-composition the editor very often refers the student to the closely attached form found in the vocabulary; I am not clear as to whether failure to make such notes in not a few instances is intentional.

Generally speaking I have noted no word missing in the vocabulary, but there are a fairly large number of meanings and idioms missing. Here follow the cases I have observed: *så* (not to be translated), 10, 73; *om också*, 11, 102; *jo-o* (11, 117) and *ja-a* (45, 166) deserve mention as well as *nå-å*, given under *nå*; *vända sig*, 14, 36; *mitt uppe i*, 14, 50; *den här*, 15, 55; *maka sig*, 16, 108; *taga itu med* (vocabulary: "take hold of"), 20, 37; *en så* (=such a), 25, 57; *vilken* (=what a), 25, 76; *taga* (=take hold of), 27, 133; *den där*, 32, 93; *så* (=so that), 33, 123; *allra* (=very), 50, 140; *tog igen*, 83, 98; *håller på att* (progressive), 84, 120; *vilken som helst* (=any), 96, 92; *båda* (=two), 103, 91. In one or two of the cases mentioned the editor may have had in mind a different translation of the passage in question than I do, and in at least three cases there are (belated) notes giving the meaning. In cases like *maka sig*, *vända sig*, mentioned above, I think it best to give the reflexive forms, though this may not be entirely necessary.

I have observed a few words in the wrong place alphabetically; as, *bortskicka*, *kork*, *lår*, *lärft*.

There are not many errors, slips, or inconsistencies in the vocabulary. I have noted chiefly the following: Under *mången* the neuter form is not given, nor under *vilken* the plural; under *ingen* no inflection is indicated. *Pensé* has in the definite form not only *-en*, but also (and indeed almost exclusively) *-n*; cf. under *idé*. So under *byrå*, *-en* should be added. *Peng* does not occur in the singular except colloquially; *pengar*, which I should suggest giving as a *plur. tantum*, is a shortened form of the plur. of *penning*. Under *som* and *vilken* I should suggest giving also the meanings "whom" and "that." *Bannas* should not be rendered by the progressive form of the English equivalents. After *byxor* omit "f." and after *lärfst* and *förlag* omit "n." *En* meaning "people" should be given as a separate word, without neuter form, defined "one, people." Should not the definitions for *fasligt* be "horribly, terribly" instead of "horrible, terrible?" In indicating the declension of *finger*, I should suggest that only the forms *finger*, *finger* be given or that it be indicated that the forms *finger*, *finger*

fingrar are far more common than *fingern* and (plur.) *finger*. Under *finnas* it would be well to add "be." The indication of the neuter should be made uniform in *blå, fri, grå, ny*. The plural form *huvuden* is omitted (cf. 10, 88). *Lov* does not occur in the definite form with the meanings given; on the contrary the definite form of *mitt* should be given (cf. 21, 72). Under *längre*, add "see *långt* (cf. 55, 8) and *länge* (cf. 55, 9)." Under *längst* it would be well to add "longest." In giving the principal parts of strong verbs the editor has in a few instances forgotten to give the past plural when its root vowel differs from that of the past singular; as, *befinna, bortgiva, rinna*. In the case of some irregular and strong forms no reference is given to the lexicographical form; as, *bröder* (7, 9), *tänder* (14, 53), *ränder* (16, 1), *slunko* (106, 187).

It may often be puzzling to determine just in what way translations given in the vocabulary should correspond with the stylistic (etc.) coloring of the text. It seems, though, that the sentence on p. 36, l. 58 should not first have to be rendered by the student using the vocabulary as "whither Svante had betaken himself" and then retranslated into natural English "where Svante had gone." Besides "where," the meaning "wherever" should be added under *varit* (cf. 14, 36). Stiffer than the original is also, e. g., the translation p. 77, n. 3: "The hen was indeed to be pitied." Notes that are not intentionally literal should unquestionably aim to make as close an approach as possible to the best rendering from all points of view.

Misprints are rather numerous in the vocabulary, and some are also to be found in the text and notes, but owing to lack of space I shall not mention any of them here. Instead, I shall call attention to a condition that may be due to inconsistency rather than to mere proofreading. In the case of the forms *be, ge, ha, ska, ta*, we find *be* or *be'*, etc., indiscriminately, often on the same page. The best usage of the present day omits the apostrophe.

In general appearance and typographically this volume calls for criticism along the same lines as that made in the review of Stomberg's edition of *Fritiofs saga* in this number. In the second edition of *Mina pojkar* the table of contents has been moved from the end of the volume, but again put in an unusual place,—after the introduction (which it includes). The second edition is greatly improved by the numbering of the lines, but rather awkwardly the numbers run through each entire chapter; the figures also are unconventionally large, an eight point figure going better with a ten point text for this purpose.

A. LOUIS ELMQUIST.